

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The final Office Action of January 11, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-10, 18-21 and 38-40 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claims 1, 18 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office asserts that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. The features to which the Office objects relate to determining a receiving schedule of a first receiver based on complementary information received by a second receiver. These features are clearly supported and described throughout Applicants' Specification and at least at paragraph [0024]. For example, paragraph [0024] discloses that a service announcement may be received by a cellular transceiver (i.e., second receiver) and processed by a controller (i.e., a component of mobile terminal 200, see FIG. 2) to inform the DVB-T receiver (i.e., first receiver) of when the video clip will be broadcast so that the DVB-T receiver may be powered up and configured in time to receive and decode the video clip. As such, the controller inherently determines a schedule, based on the service announcement, for powering up and configuring the DVB-T receiver so that the DVB-T is prepared in time to receive and decode the video clip. In other words, the controller uses the service announcement to determine when the DVB-T receiver should be ready to receive the content advertised by the service announcement (i.e., receiving schedule). Claims 1, 18 and 38 are thus allowable in view of the foregoing reasons.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-8, 10, 18-21 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tegler *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,481 B1, "Tegler"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 18 recite, *inter alia*, determining a receiving schedule of a first receiver of a mobile terminal based on complementary information received by a second receiver of the mobile terminal. Nowhere does Tegler teach or suggest such features. Significantly, the Office even conceded that Tegler “does not disclose wherein the mobile terminal determines a receive schedule of the first receiver based on the complementary information.” Office Action dated April 4, 2006, p. 3. Curiously, the Office now claims that Tegler does disclose such features at col. 3, ll. 47-53. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office’s new position. The cited passage of Tegler merely refers to DVB producing protocols for data broadcast which makes possible for a set-top-box to find data information in a broadcast channel. Col. 3, ll. 47-53. Even assuming, without admitting, that finding data information in a broadcast channel constitutes a receiving schedule, Tegler does not teach or suggest that the ability to find data information in a broadcast channel is determined based on complementary information received by a second receiver. At best, Tegler discloses transmitting interactive data using either a broadband broadcast channel or a GSM downlink. Col. 3, ll. 47-50. Tegler makes no connection between data received by the GSM receiver and the ability to find data information in a broadcast channel. Claims 1 and 18 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-8, 10, 19 and 21 are dependent on claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim 38 generally relates to, *inter alia*, receiving a first signal through a first communication network including a communication service and a second signal through a second communication network, the second signal including a service announcement associated with the communication service, and determining a receiving schedule based on information included in the second signal. Nowhere does Tegler teach or suggest such features. At most, Tegler discloses a broadband broadcast network and a GSM downlink. However, Tegler lacks any teaching or suggestion of determining a receiving schedule based on a second signal including a service announcement received through a second communications network. As discussed above, Tegler’s disclosure in col. 3, ll. 47-53, merely relates to DVB protocols for finding data information in a broadcast channel, rather than determining a receiving schedule

based on a second signal including a service announcement received through a second communications network. As such, claim 38 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 39 and 40 are dependent on claim 38 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 38 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tegler in view of Yuen (WO 00/18123). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1 and is thus allowable over Tegler for at least the same reasons as claim 1 (as discussed above). Yuen fails to cure the deficiencies of Tegler and thus, even in combination with Tegler, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 1 and 9 are allowable for at least these reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 13 day of March, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/  
Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001